

1 THE HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT TACOMA

10 ROY J. LeFEVRE and ROSALIND T.
11 LeFEVRE, husband and wife; and
12 LAURIE J. V. OLSON, PERSONAL
13 REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESTATE OF
14 JAMES OLSON, AND INDIVIDUALLY AS
15 THE SURVIVING SPOUSE OF JAMES
16 OLSON,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.
19 CBS CORPORATION; et al.,

20 Defendants.

21 NO. 3:13-cv-05058-RBL

22 DEFENDANT CROWN CORK & SEAL
23 COMPANY, INC.'S MOTION FOR
24 RECONSIDERATION ON ITS MOTION
25 FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS TO
26 LAURIE J.V. OLSON'S CLAIMS

27 NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
DECEMBER 10, 2013

28
29 Defendant Crown Cork & Seal Company, Inc. ("Crown Cork") respectfully requests
30 that the Court reconsider its decision denying summary judgment in its favor because the
31 Court erred in ruling that Plaintiff Olson created a genuine issue of material fact on the issue
32 of causation. Plaintiff's medical causation expert Samuel Hammar, M.D., did not address
33 Crown Cork in his initial report, specifically excluded Crown Cork in his declaration, and
34 Plaintiff's counsel specifically advised that the supplemental causation reports do not apply to
35 Crown Cork. Likewise, Plaintiff's medical causation expert did not address the type of
36 exposure – take-home/household – at issue against Crown Cork in the Olson case. The record
37 contains a dearth of evidence that James Olson was exposed to respirable asbestos fibers in his

1 household from products for which Crown Cork¹ would be responsible. Under these
 2 circumstances, Plaintiff Olson cannot establish that asbestos fibers from a Mundet Cork product
 3 was a substantial factor in causing the injuries for which she seeks relief. In the absence of
 4 such proof, summary judgment is appropriate and the Court should reconsider its ruling
 5 denying summary judgment.

6 II. FACTS

7 In the interests of brevity, Crown Cork incorporates the statement of facts set forth in its
 8 motion for summary judgment as though fully set forth herein.

9 III. ISSUES PRESENTED

10 1. Should the Court reconsider its denial of summary judgment as to Crown Cork
 11 when Plaintiff Olson has presented no admissible evidence supporting the conclusion that
 12 James Olson was exposed to respirable asbestos fibers in his house from a product
 13 manufactured, sold or distributed by Mundet Cork, or that any household exposure James
 14 Olson may have had to a Mundet Cork asbestos-containing product was a substantial factor in
 15 causing James Olson's alleged disease?

16 IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

17 This motion is based upon the pleadings and documents on file with the Court.

18 V. ARGUMENT

19 A party may seek reconsideration of a ruling on a summary judgment motion pursuant
 20 to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) (motion to alter or amend a judgment) or 60(b)
 21 (relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding) and Western District of Washington Local
 22 Rule 7(h). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court . . . committed clear error or
 23 the initial decision was manifestly unjust."² Respectfully, reconsideration of the Court's
 24 Order denying summary judgment in Crown Cork's favor is necessary in this case because the
 25 Court committed "clear error" and its initial decision was manifestly unjust insofar.

26 ¹ Plaintiff Olson's claims against Crown Cork result only from Mr. Olson's alleged exposure to Mundet Cork
 27 products.

² *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993).

Crown Cork submits that the Court erred in its application of the 2011 Washington decision *Morgan*³, and the broader causation framework set forth in *Lockwood*⁴ and its progeny. Pursuant to the same, Plaintiff bears the burden of coming forward with sufficient admissible evidence to show that a Mundet Cork product's usage in proximity to James Olson's father supports a reasonable inference that the product was then carried home on his father's clothing and that thereafter James Olson's exposure to such product was a substantial factor in causing the asbestos-related disease.⁵ Specifically, Plaintiff must demonstrate that Mr. Olson's father, a marine electrician, worked with or around a Mundet Cork asbestos-containing product that released asbestos fibers that adhered to his clothing and then brought such respirable asbestos fibers home to James Olson with sufficient frequency, regularity, and proximity exposure to cause the alleged illness.⁶

Lockwood requires proof of ***medical causation***.⁷ But Plaintiff failed to offer any medical causation testimony against Crown Cork. To the contrary, Plaintiff's medical causation expert has not and cannot provide any causal connection between James Olson's alleged household exposure to Mundet Cork products and his disease. Plaintiff's medical causation expert offers no opinions regarding James Olson's household exposure to Mundet Cork products, nor does he establish a causal connection between any Mundet Cork product and James Olson's disease.⁸ The absence of medical causation testimony alone warrants reconsideration of the Court's denial of summary judgment.

Additionally, Crown Cork believes that the Court erred when it accepted the Plaintiff's interpretation of *Morgan* in determining whether Plaintiff Olson had set forth sufficient admissible medical causation evidence to defeat summary judgment. In her briefing in opposition to Crown Cork's motion for summary judgment, Plaintiff asserts that *Morgan*

³ *Morgan v. Aurora Pump Co.*, 159 Wash. App. 724, 727, 248 P.3d 1052, 1055 review denied, 172 Wash. 2d 1015, 262 P.3d 63 (2011).

⁴ *Lockwood v. AC&S, Inc.*, 109 Wn.2d 235, 245, 744 P.2d 605 (1987).

⁵ *Id.*, at 248.

⁶ *Lockwood*, 109 Wn.2d at 248.

⁷ *Id.*, at 248-49.

⁸ See, e.g., Federal Report of Samuel P. Hammar, M.D., Dkt. No. 156.

1 allows a plaintiff to overcome summary judgment in the absence of product-specific
 2 testimony with evidence that asbestos exposure caused a claimant's mesothelioma.⁹ Plaintiff
 3 states that she is "not required to present specific causation evidence, i.e., expert opinion that
 4 asbestos from [Mundet] was a 'substantial contributing factor' in causing the disease."¹⁰ Not
 5 so. Plaintiff grossly misinterpreted the *Morgan* decision to the Court's (and Crown Cork's)
 6 detriment. If the Court is to accept Plaintiff's interpretation of *Morgan*, Washington will be a
 7 *de facto* absolute liability state – under those circumstances, liability would attach every time
 8 a claimant can prove that an asbestos-containing product was merely present anywhere at the
 9 300 acres of PSNS. Washington law requires more than that.

10 While an asbestos plaintiff may establish exposure through circumstantial evidence,
 11 the evidence supporting exposure must have sufficient indicia of reliability.¹¹ Certainly,
 12 Washington law requires Plaintiff to place Mundet Cork asbestos-containing products in the
 13 vicinity of Mr. Olson's father at PSNS and that such product was carried home and thereafter
 14 James Olson was exposed to such products. In *Morgan*, the Court found that the use of
 15 circumstantial evidence of exposure was sufficient to defeat summary judgment where the
 16 plaintiff submitted deposition testimony of coworkers and expert witnesses regarding PSNS -
 17 the one site at issue. One of the coworkers was, like the plaintiff, a pipefitter at PSNS, where
 18 he worked with the plaintiff aboard three aircraft carriers.¹² That coworker further testified
 19 extensively about the work he personally observed the plaintiff performing at PSNS, including
 20 work near defendants' products.¹³ The *Morgan* plaintiff also offered the testimony of a
 21 superintendent at PSNS, who testified that "almost all" of the equipment at issue in the case
 22 that was used at PSNS contained asbestos, and linked that equipment to the original
 23 manufacturer defendants.¹⁴

24 ⁹ Plaintiffs' Omnibus Response in Opposition to Motions for Summary Judgment, 27:13-20.

25 ¹⁰ *Id.*

26 ¹¹ *Morgan, supra.*, 159 Wash. App. 724; *Allen v. Asbestos Corp., Ltd.*, 138 Wash.App. 564, 571, 157 P.3d 406
 (2007).

27 ¹² *Morgan*, at 731.

¹³ *Id.*, at 732.

¹⁴ *Id.*, at 733.

1 Similarly, the *Morgan* plaintiff offered expert testimony confirming that direct PSNS
 2 exposures were the only causative factor in the subject mesothelioma.¹⁵ When the only
 3 evidence of exposure to asbestos-containing products was at PSNS, plaintiff's expert was able
 4 to provide a medical causal connection between Mr. Morgan's work at PSNS and his
 5 mesothelioma.¹⁶ Under those circumstances, the *Morgan* court found that the plaintiff raised a
 6 genuine issue of material fact that he was exposed to asbestos contained in products that were
 7 made, sold, or supplied to PSNS by each of the defendants and that such exposure was a
 8 substantial factor in causing his mesothelioma.¹⁷

9 The facts presented here are vastly different than those presented in *Morgan*. The
 10 differences create the basis for Crown Cork's request for reconsideration. First, there is a
 11 marked paucity of testimony from James Olson's father's PSNS coworkers. The Court has
 12 not heard any evidence placing Mr. Olson's father in the vicinity of a Mundet Cork asbestos-
 13 containing product. Unlike in *Morgan*, where the plaintiff put forth evidence of specific job
 14 functions that the plaintiff performed in discrete areas, Plaintiff has only presented generalized
 15 descriptions of marine electricians' job functions at PSNS while Mr. Olson's father was
 16 employed there. In this case, the speculative nature of the evidence of Mr. Olson's father's
 17 alleged exposures is markedly different than the unambiguous testimony of Mr. Morgan's
 18 direct coworkers.

19 Moreover, the expert testimony in this case differs from that presented in *Morgan*. It
 20 bears repeating that the only exposures which allegedly involve Mundet Cork are "take-
 21 home" exposures via Mr. Olson's father. Therefore, there are two distinct types of exposure
 22 which could have contributed to Mr. Olson's disease: take-home, and directly while Mr.
 23 Olson himself served in the U.S. Navy and then worked as a sandblaster and painter at PSNS.
 24 The only scientific causation evidence in the record – from Crown Cork's expert Dr. Dennis
 25 Paustenbach – establishes that the take-home exposure did not increase the risk of James

26 ¹⁵ *Id.*, at 734.
 27 ¹⁶ *Id.*
 27 ¹⁷ *Id.*, at 735.

1 Olson's disease. Certainly, Plaintiff's medical causation evidence, which only addresses
2 James Olson's direct exposures and does not address the alleged Crown Cork take-home
3 exposure, does not rise to the level of *Morgan*. The absence of such causation evidence is
4 fatal to Plaintiff's claim and warrants reconsideration of the Court's denial of summary
5 judgment as to Crown Cork.

6 **VI. CONCLUSION**

7 For the reasons given above, the Crown Cork respectfully requests that the Court
8 reconsider its Order denying summary judgment and dismiss all of Plaintiff Olson's claims
9 currently pending against it.

10 DATED this 10th day of December, 2013

11 SEDGWICK LLP

13 By: s/ Barry N. Mesher

14 Barry N. Mesher, WSBA No. 07845
Sedgwick LLP
15 520 Pike Street, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101
16 Phone: (206) 462-7560
Fax: (206) 462-7561
17 Barry.mesher@sedgwicklaw.com
Attorneys for Defendant
18 Crown Cork & Seal Company, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Helen Van Buren, hereby make the following Declaration from personal knowledge:

On December 10, 2013, I presented the attached document to the Clerk of the Court for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system. In accordance with their ECF registration agreement and the Court's rules, the Clerk of the Court will send e-mail notification of such filing to the following attorneys:

<p>Attorneys for Plaintiff:</p> <p>Matthew P. Bergman Glenn S. Draper Anna D. Knudson Brian F. Ladenburg Bergman Draper Ladenburg, PLLC 614 First Avenue, Fourth Floor Seattle, WA 98104 TEL: (206) 957-9510 FAX: (206) 957-9549</p> <p>glenng@bergmanlegal.com annak@bergmanlegal.com matt@bergmanlegal.com brian@bergmanlegal.com</p>	<p>Attorneys for CBS Corporation f/k/a Viacom Inc.; General Electric Company; Rapid-American Corporation:</p> <p>Christopher S. Marks Eliot M. Harris Sedgwick LLP 520 Pike Street, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101 TEL: (206) 462-7560 FAX: (206) 462-7561</p> <p>chris.marks@sedgwicklaw.com eliot.harris@sedgwicklaw.com</p>
<p>Attorneys for CBS Corporation:</p> <p>William D. Harvard, Pro Hac Vice Evert Weathersby Houff 200 Cleveland Road, Suite 6 Bogart, GA 30622</p> <p>WDHarvard@ewhlaw.com</p>	<p>Attorneys for Metropolitan Life Insurance Company:</p> <p>Richard G. Gawlowski Wilson, Smith, Cochran & Dickerson 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1700 Seattle, WA 98164 TEL: (206) 623-4100 FAX: (206) 623-9273</p> <p>gawlowski@wscd.com</p>
<p>Attorneys for Warren Pumps, LLC:</p> <p>J. Michael Mattingly Rizzo Mattingly Bosworth PC 1300 SW Sixth Ave., Suite 330 Portland, OR 97201-3530 TEL: (503) 229-1819 FAX: (503) 229-0630</p> <p>mmattingly@rizzopc.com</p>	<p>Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.:</p> <p>Alexander Paul Catalona Schiff Hardin LLP One Market, Spear Street Tower Thirty-Second Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 TEL: (415) 901-8700 FAX: (415) 901-8701</p> <p>acatalona@schiffhardin.com</p>

1	Attorneys for Lone Star Industries, Inc.: Howard (Terry) Hall Wolfstone, Panchot & Bloch, P.S., Inc. 1111 Third Avenue, Suite 1800 Seattle, WA 98101 TEL: 206.682.3840 fax: 206.340.8837 <u>thall@wpblaw.com</u>	Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.: Mark J. Fucile Fucile & Reising LLP 800 NW Sixth Avenue, Suite 211 Portland, OR 97209-3783 TEL: 503-224-4895 FAX: 503-224-4332 <u>mark@frllp.com</u>
7	Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.: Steven Fogg Corr Cronin Michelson Baumgardner & Preece LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900 Seattle, WA 98154-1051 <u>sfogg@corrchronin.com</u>	Attorneys for General Electric Company: Erik Nadolink Wheeler Trigg O'Donnell 370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4500 Denver, CO 80202-5647 TEL: (303) 244-1800 <u>nadolink@wtotrial.com</u>
12	Attorneys for Lone Star Industries, Inc.: J. Scott Wood Foley & Mansfield PLLP 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3850 Seattle, WA 98104 TEL: (206) 456-5360 FAX: (206) 456-5361 <u>swood@foleymansfield.com</u>	Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.: Robert H. Riley Edward Casmire Stephen M. Copenhaver Matthew J. Fischer Schiff Hardin LLP 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 6600 Chicago, IL 60606 <u>rriley@schiffhardin.com</u> <u>ecasmire@schiffhardin.com</u> <u>scopenhaver@schiffhardin.com</u> <u>mfischer@schiffhardin.com</u>
19	Attorneys for General Electric Company: John Heller Sidley Austin LLP One South Dearborn Chicago, IL 60603 TEL: (312) 853-7704 <u>jheller@sedley.com</u>	Attorneys for Plaintiff: Thomas H. Hart, III Law Offices of Thomas H. Hart, III 207 E. 1 st N. Street Summerville, South Carolina 29483 TEL: (843) 410-0711 <u>tom@thhpc.com</u>

1 **Attorneys for Plaintiff:**
2 William A. Galerston
3 Randall Iola
4 Stanley Iola, LLP
5 3100 Monticell Ave., Suite 750
6 Dallas, TX 75205
7 TEL: (214) 443-4307
8 wgalerston@stanleyiola.com
9 riola@stanleyiola.com

1 **Attorneys for General Electric Company:**
2 John M. Fitzpatrick
3 Wheeler Trigg O'Donnell
4 370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4500
5 Denver, CO 80202-5647
6 Fitzpatrick@wtotrial.com

7
8 I HEREBY DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the
9 United States of America and the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

10 EXECUTED this 10th day of December, 2013, at Seattle, Washington.

11 _____
12 Helen Van Buren